

**REMARKS**

The allowance of Claims 28 and 32 is gratefully acknowledged. Entry of Claims 35-38 is respectfully requested for the following reasons.

Initially, the undersigned gratefully acknowledges the timely and helpful assistance of Examiner McNelis regarding a draft Amendment Under 37 CFR §1.312 submitted on November 10, 2006. During a telephone conference with Examiner McNelis on November 13, 2006, the Examiner indicated that the Amendment would not be entered because the Claim 36 phrase "the hot rolling, heating or temperature holding process for a short period of time is carried out after rough rolling" lacked antecedent basis. In a second telephone conference on November 14, 2006, the undersigned pointed out that (1) the terminology in Claim 36 is identical to originally filed Claim 30 and (2) the antecedent basis issue would be resolved by rewording the Claim 36 phrase to recite "in the hot rolling, a heating or temperature holding process for a short period of time is carried out after rough rolling". A discussion of the heating/holding process and rough rolling recited in original Claim 30 (new Claim 36) can be found in the specification at page 6, lines 5-8; page 12, lines 11-18 and 26-28; footnote of Table 2).

In the Amendment filed September 8, 2006, Claim 28 was rewritten in independent form to include all features of Claim 27 and Claims 27, 29 and 31-34 were canceled.

New Claim 35 depends from Claim 28 and is identical to cancelled Claim 29 which depended from now cancelled Claim 27. Claim 28 was rewritten in independent form to include the features of Claim 27. Thus, Claim 35 merely presents the features of cancelled Claim 29 and does not introduce any new matter or present any new issues.

New Claim 36 depends from Claim 35 and is identical to cancelled Claim 30 which depended from Claim 29 (now represented as Claim 35) except for the addition of "in" and "a" in line 2 to address the antecedent basis issue discussed above. Thus, Claim 36 merely presents the features of cancelled Claim 30 and does not introduce any new matter or present any new issues.

New Claim 37 depends from Claim 35 and is identical to cancelled Claim 33 which depended from Claim 29 (now represented as Claim 35). Thus, Claim 37 merely presents the features of cancelled Claim 30 and does not introduce any new matter or present any new issues.

New Claim 38 depends from Claim 36 and is identical to cancelled Claim 34 which depended from Claim 30 (now represented as Claim 36). Thus, Claim 37 merely presents the features of cancelled Claim 34 and does not introduce any new matter or present any new issues.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that new Claims 35-38 merely represent the identical subject matter of cancelled Claims 29, 30, 33 and 34. Thus, pursuant to the provisions set forth in MPEP §714.16(a), because Claims 35-38 are

needed for proper protection of the invention and consideration thereof requires no additional work on the part of the Office, entry thereof is respectfully requested..

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: November 14, 2006

P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404  
(703) 836-6620

By: \_\_\_\_\_

  
Peter K. Skiff

Registration No. 31,917